



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/002,241	10/23/2001	Machteld Maria Mertens	2001B099	2764

23455 7590 06/02/2003

EXXONMOBIL CHEMICAL COMPANY
P O BOX 2149
BAYTOWN, TX 77522-2149

EXAMINER

MEDINA SANABRIA, MARIBEL

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1754

DATE MAILED: 06/02/2003

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/002,241

Applicant(s)

MERTENS ET AL.

Examiner

Maribel Medina

Art Unit

1754

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 October 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 21 and 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 10, 11 and 13 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 10, 11 and 13 are objected to because of the following informalities: In claims 10, 11 and 13 the term “having” should be changed to --has--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4. Claim 14 is indefinite for use of improper Markush language. The phrase “...ALPO-46, and metal containing forms thereof, and mixtures thereof” is confusing and renders the claim indefinite. The phrase should be changed to read --...ALPO-46, [and] metal containing forms thereof, and mixtures thereof--

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 and Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 1754

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over US Patent No. 5,744,680 (Mulavaney, III et al)

Mulavaney, III et al disclose a catalyst comprising a crystalline molecular sieve such as SAPO and method for making olefins using said catalyst wherein the catalyst is contacted with a feedstock comprising at least one oxygenate under conditions suitable to convert the oxygenate into olefins (See column 2, lines 42-60).

In the event any differences can be shown for the product of the product by process claim 21, as opposed to the product taught by Mulavaney, III et al, such differences would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art as a routine modification of the product in the absence of a showing of unexpected results; see also *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

8. Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over US Patent No. 6,121,503 (Janssen et al)

Janssen et al disclose a catalyst comprising a crystalline molecular sieve such as SAPO-34 and method for making olefins using said catalyst wherein the catalyst is contacted with a feedstock comprising at least one oxygenate under conditions suitable to convert the oxygenate into olefins.

In the event any differences can be shown for the product of the product by process claim 21, as opposed to the product taught by Janssen et al, such differences would have been obvious

Art Unit: 1754

to one of ordinary skill in the art as a routine modification of the product in the absence of a showing of unexpected results; see also *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Allowable Subject Matter

9. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Claims 1-20 are allowable upon consideration the prior art. The prior art discloses a processor for synthesizing crystalline molecular sieves comprising the steps of: forming an aqueous reaction mixture containing reactive sources of aluminum, phosphorus, nitrogen-containing organic templating agent, and optionally silicon; heating and maintaining said reaction mixture at a temperature of at least 100°C in a reactor until crystals are formed; and recovering the molecular sieve. (See US Patent 5,296,208)

The prior art fails to disclose or suggest the steps of “wherein during any period of time after substantial completion of the crystallization and prior to the recovery, the slurry is held under substantially static conditions.” Nor would there be any motivation from the prior art to do so.

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to the examiner Maribel Medina. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30 AM to 3:30 PM. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

Examiner: Maribel Medina *MM*

Tel: 703-305-1928

Fax: 703-872-9310

May 28, 2003


STANLEY S. SILVERMAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700